Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/068,261	DICKENS, JAMES EDWARD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Eric V Woods	2672
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Pending</u>	
(1) Eric V Woods.	(3)	
(2) <u>Michael Lukon (48,164)</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>17 May 2005</u>	Time: <u>8:30 am EST</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: 8, 15, 21		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a writt record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview.
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicar	nt/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner had concerns about the exact wording of the language, because the specification clearly set forth that the registration marks were present so that the once the scanner had the image of the scanned form, it could orient it in the correct manner and extract the chracters, and the claims as written would cover situations where the marks were only present so that the user would know how to properly orient the paper for the scanner. Examiner proposed certain changes to applicant's representative to correct the potential indefiniteness issues.